



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,102	08/17/2001	Akiho Mitsuteru	PHJ 99,028	5484
24737	7590	05/04/2004	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			ALAVI, ALI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2875	
DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/932,102

Applicant(s)

MITSUTERU, AKIHO

Examiner

Ali Alavi

Art Unit

2875

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4/09/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

1. The request for a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) filed on 4/09/04 is acknowledged. 37 CFR 1.53(d)(1) was amended to provide that the CPA must be for a design patent and the prior application of the CPA must be a design application that is complete as defined by 37 CFR 1.51(b). See *Elimination of Continued Prosecution Application Practice as to Utility and Plant Patent Applications*, final rule, 68 *Fed. Reg.* 32376 (May 30, 2003), 1271 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 143 (June 24, 2003). Since a CPA of this application is not permitted under 37 CFR 1.53(d)(1), the improper request for a CPA is being treated as a request for continued examination of this application under 37 CFR 1.114.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 1-5 recites in part "...wherein the light sources are provided so as to have the same parasitic capacitance caused by intervals between the light sources and the light reflection member." This limitation was not given patentable

weight because it is unclear as to how parasitic capacitance works in the absence of unexpected test results or any theoretical formula to support this limitation.

Furthermore, Applicant responded that the parasitic capacitance is not an object but it is a physical property like mass, charge, density, etc. Moreover, physical property of matters are not given patentable weight because matters are inherently contain specific physical properties unless they are supported by any unexpected test result in which renders it unobvious. Applicant may amend the specification to include support for the parasitic capacitance without entering a new matter into the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al (US pat. No 6,390,638 B1).

Miller discloses a device for illuminating a flat panel display including a light guide (210, fig. 2), and three or more light sources (160, 170, fig. 2), provided at at least one of side ends of the light guide plate, and a light reflection member (220, fig. 2) surrounding the light sources, that reflects light emitted from the light sources to the light guide plate. Miller discloses the invention as claimed but shows only two light sources instead of three light sources. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to add more than two light sources since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Claims 1-3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art of Marz (EP 0854318 A1).

As best understood, Marz shows a device for illuminating a flat panel display including a light guide (10, fig. 1), and three or more light sources (13, fig. 1), provided at at least one of side ends of the light guide plate, and a light reflection member (14, fig. 1) surrounding the light sources, that reflects light emitted from the light sources to the light guide plate, wherein at least one of said light sources positioned at the center is closer to an end of said light reflection member farthest from said opening to said light guide (see fig. 1).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Ali Alavi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2365. The examiner can normally be reached between 7:00 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. Tuesday to Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sandy O'Shea can be reached at (571) 272-2378 or you may fax your inquiry to the **Central Fax** at (703) 872-9306.

Ali Alavi

Examiner

